

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. An Office action dated June 15, 2005 is presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 9-11, 16-17, and 19 have been amended and no claims have been added or cancelled; therefore, Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

The § 112 Rejections of the Claims

Claims 4-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, there was some confusion as to in what direction the ring is free to rotate. Applicant asserts that the claims were clear as originally written, but in order to expedite prosecution of this application, have amended Figure 5, the Specification, and the claims, to more particularly point out the direction of rotation of the ring.

Specifically, with reference to the figures, FIG. 5 has been amended to curl the arrows A to be more consistent with the continuing movement of the ring 54 when the ring is rotates. Although the original direction of the arrows A was correct, continued movement of the ring would be along the curved arrows A in amended Claim 5.

For the specification, a line has been added to Paragraph 28 to restate the movement of the outer portion of the ring or the rotation of the ring provided by the invention. The description is consistent with problems discussed with respect to the prior art in Paragraphs 25 and 26, and the description of the movement included in the original application at Paragraph 28 and in the original claims.

The claims have been amended to define an axis along a portion of the ring, and the rotation occurs about that tangent axis. The tangent axis does not have to meet with the outer edge of the ring, but instead just a portion of the ring. Applicant respectfully submit that the claims are now clear, and the § 112 rejection should be withdrawn.

The § 102 Rejections of the Claims

Claims 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,776,179 to Chin. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 has been amended to more particularly point out that the pole connector is anchored to the ring. In *Chin*, the pole connector is not anchored to the ring, but instead is anchored to the webbing, which in turn is attached to the ring. Thus, Applicant submits that the rejection in view of *Chin* should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated under U.S. Patent Number 5,901,726 to Gal et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out that both sections of the split webbing are attached to the fabric structure. This is not the case in *Gal*, where the second section of the split webbing is a free flap. Thus, the rejection of Claim 1 in view of *Gal* should be withdrawn. For Claims 4 and 11, the structure in *Gal* does not allow rotation of the ring as is set forth in the amended claims. In fact, the structure in *Gal* suffers many of the setbacks described with reference FIG. 3 in the present application.

Claims 4-8, 10-17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,021,795 to Long et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As with *Gal*, *Long* discloses a structure in which the pole is anchored to webbing instead of a ring. The structure in *Long* does not include a pin attached to the ring as is in Claim 4, or a pole connector anchored to the ring as in Claim 11. Thus, for at least these reasons, the rejections based upon *Long* should be withdrawn.


For the sake of clarity, the independent claims of the application are discussed in this and the other section 102 rejection. Applicants submit that the independent claims are allowable, and therefore the dependent claims are allowable at least because they are dependent upon allowed claims. Nevertheless, Applicants submit that the dependent claims further define subject matter not shown or made obvious by the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 define patentable subject matter, and that the application is in good and proper condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully solicited.

If the foregoing does not result in a Notice of Allowance in the application, Applicants earnestly solicit the Examiner to call the undersigned at 206-521-5984.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RW', is written over a horizontal line.

Roger D. Wylie, Reg. No. 36,974

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet includes changes to Figure 5. This sheet, which includes FIG. 4, replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 4 and 5. FIG. 5 has been amended to add curvature to the arrows A to be more consistent with the description in the specification.